

**REMARKS**

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Office Action dated May 27, 2004. Claims 1-26 are pending in this application. Applicant has amended Claims 1 and 14 to more clearly point out the present inventive concept. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Buckley et al.* in view of *Harris et al.* This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described in the previous response, the *Buckley et al.* reference is a reference that is directed toward collecting a plurality of bar codes and then transmitting these bar codes to a computer. The patentee in *Buckley* provided a number of embodiments. One embodiment is that of Figure 4. In the Figure 4 embodiment, the patentee referred to an indirect method for providing a barcode to internet connection. The reference that was relied upon for incorporation was WO97/01137, the *Hudetz* reference, which US counterpart was cited by Applicant. This reference is merely a way to scan a bar code, send the bar code to a server, have the server look up the bar code in a relational data base to determine the URLs that are associated therewith and then return a list of these URLs back to the user computer, at which time the user computer makes a decision as to what location to go to or the user does so through a display of these returned URLs. A second embodiment in the *Buckley et al.* reference is that associated with Figure 5, the one referred to by the Examiner. In this embodiment, a bar code is scanned and then the bar code sent to application software (204). This application software then determines the mapping of the bar codes to the URLs. Once these URLs have been retrieved, they are passed to a browser (206) through a path (203). At this point in time, what occurs is that the URLs are displayed to the user. This is described beginning at Column 11, Line 13, wherein it states that the browser "then displays the information, e.g., as links." Thus, the Examiner is correct in that there is no unique code associated with the scanner nor is there anyway to utilize such a unique kind of code to connect to a remote location. The only place any type of permanent connection is provided is in the application software (204), but this application software is not uniquely associated with the scanning

**AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE**

S/N 09/659,520

Atty. Dkt. No. PHL Y-25,355

device nor is it such that it has no location information associated therewith. In fact, this application software (204) would have the URL of the portal server (208), such that no lookup would be required in relational data base, i.e., the location information is associated therewith.

The Examiner utilized the *Harris et al* reference to support the missing aspect of the *Buckley et al.* reference. The *Harris et al.* reference utilizes a unique ID for a personalized electronic device. The Examiner has specifically referred to a number of areas in the Specification. In the Abstract of the invention, it is stated that communication between two or more devices is established when the devices are determined to be compatible. In Column 17, Line 18-23, it is disclosed that one device may be programmed to be recognized by one or more of a security group unit serial number, a unique security group identifier that identifies the owner, a physical address and/or a telephone number for a usage site and the like. Thus, there is provided some kind of unique identifier for the electronic device. However, Applicant notes that there are many electronic devices that include unique identifiers for the purpose of identifying a particular device to another device. One well-known example of this is a Network Interface Card (NIC). Each of these cards is given a unique Ethernet ID. This address is unique to each NIC and there are a very large number of addresses that are given out in blocks to manufacturers of these Ethernet Cards. Thus, it is not the unique ID of a particular electronic device that is unique; rather, it is the association of a unique identifier with a triggering device that, when transmitted to an interface device causes the interface device to determine the location information associated with that unique identifier. The unique identifier in and out of itself has no location information associated therewith in Applicant's inventive system as defined by the amended claims. Thus, when the unique identifier with no routing information or location information associated therewith is received, then a determination is made as to where the associated location is. This is defined in the step of "retrieving location information." The *Harris et al.* reference actually teaches against utilizing these device addresses for the purpose of establishing a connection to a location. In Column 28, Lines 30-33, it is stated that:

Although device addresses are not needed to establish connections, device names must be known by connected peers before meaningful communication can be established and information exchanged.

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE  
S/N 09/659,520  
Atty. Dkt. No: PHL-25,355

8

Therefore, *Harris et al.* actually teaches away from utilizing the unique identifier for anything other than for the purpose of identifying the electronic device to the recipient of a message. The recipient in *Harris* of the message does not care about the identifier defining the location but, rather, it only cares about receiving a request for information. The unique identifier in Applicant's claimed invention is utilized for the purpose of determining a location on the network rather than for the purpose of identifying an electronic device to another electronic device *after* a location is determined. Therefore, Applicant believes that the personal identifier in *Harris et al.* in combination with the teachings of *Buckley et al.*, does not anticipate or obviate Applicant's present inventive concept, as defined by the amended claims, nor is there is any suggestion or motivation in *Harris et al.* for combining *Harris et al.* with *Buckley et al.* to cure the deficiencies noted by the Examiner in *Buckley et al.* Therefore, Applicant respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection with respect to Claims 1-26.

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt in order to place this case in condition for allowance. For the reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of the claims as amended. Please charge any additional fees or deficiencies in fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-0780/PHLY-25,355 of HOWISON & ARNOTT, L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,  
HOWISON & ARNOTT, L.L.P.  
Attorneys for Applicant

  
Gregory M. Howison  
Registration No. 30,646

GMH/yoc  
P.O. Box 741715  
Dallas, Texas 75374-1715  
Tel: 972-479-0462  
Fax: 972-479-0464  
November 29, 2004

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE  
S/N 09/659,520  
Atty. Dkt. No. PHLY-25,355